

April 23, 1968

join the movement that we ourselves had started in 1776. And they made impressive progress.

Nevertheless, the Genocide Convention has been before the Senate since 1949, so has the convention on Freedom of Association and Right to Organize. The Senate has had before it since 1963 the Conventions on Political Rights for Women and the Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor.

Still not submitted to the Senate for ratification are the Convention on Discrimination in respect to Employment and Occupation (adopted in 1958), the Convention on Equal Remuneration for Men and Women for work of Equal Value (adopted in 1960), the Convention against Discrimination in Education, and the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination—adopted by the General Assembly in 1965 and signed by the United States as a UN member nation.

With this still unfinished business to face, we must also face the fact that "human rights" have taken on new dimensions in this year of 1968. In addition to the most obvious human rights needs among our minorities and poor are others which affect us all but about which we do little. A few of these are:

Radioactive wastes from atomic power plants may be unleashing a Pandora's box of poison.

Air pollution from our industrial society—and water pollution that is sealing off our rivers and lakes from recreational activities, and the preservation of wild life are all a part of that world of the individual person where universal human rights begin.

Such issues are raised by scientific and technological developments and may soon reach the danger stage not only in terms of our own country but in terms of our international relations. We have only to recall the controversy that developed over the hydrogen bomb accidentally dropped from a U.S. plane off the coast of Portugal or the equally dangerous situation when we lost nuclear warheads around Iceland.

The important role of organizations such as yours was clearly illustrated at the UN's founding conference when pressure from the people asserted through their group and organization leaders compelled the statesmen who were drafting the UN charter to include the commitment to protect human rights. That commitment, however, unless it is brought home in continuous and meaningful ways to people in this country as well as throughout the world is merely a paper pledge.

We as citizens speaking through our voluntary organizations must convince our duly elected representatives to translate this commitment into practice. This means educating public opinion about human rights conventions. It means convincing the Senate to proceed with the unfinished business of ratifying the conventions.

Educationally it means that the UN and human rights must come to life as a day to day process of living: come to life for school children as well as their parents. There is much to be proud of in our history and accomplishments. The task is to find the way, as we teach, to bring together the past, the present and the possibilities for the future—relating all this to the responsibilities of each citizen, not only to learn but also to act.

All of these are problems which offer challenges to the President's Commission. At its first meeting some of these were discussed. At our meeting next week there will be reports from those members who have been most active, and further plans will get underway. One point came out clearly at the first meeting: that was the importance for members of the Commission to work through and with organizations such as

yours; with those of you who are at the United Nations as well as with members of your organizations who work in human rights fields at all levels at home.

Whatever may be the answer to the many problems we face today both at home and abroad "business as usual" is not the way to solve them.

We might well say that the year 1968, marking the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is a good time to begin.

### CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 10, 1968, on page E2910 in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I extended a tribute to the retiring president of the University of Texas at El Paso, Dr. Joseph M. Ray.

In the printing of the RECORD, there was an error in the second line, when the university was referred to as "the fastest-growing" universities in Texas, rather than "one of the fastest-growing."

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected to read "one of the fastest-growing universities of Texas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected.

### file SMALL BUSINESS EXPORT TRADE CORPORATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for the past couple of weeks I have been receiving calls from the press, from Members of Congress, from interested businessmen, and from a wide variety of sources concerning reports that I intend soon to introduce a bill providing for the development of structures to be known as Small Business Export Trade Corporations. Much of the interest has derived from an article by H. J. Maidenberry in the New York Times of April 14 entitled "Small Units for Exports Suggested."

As the Times article notes, the basis upon which the bill is being drafted is the considerable experience, over some 15 years, of Eugene M. Lang, of the Resources & Facilities Corp. Mr. Lang originally conceived the outlines of the proposal several years ago and on April 10, 1963, discussed it before the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives.

In order that my colleagues may be more fully aware of the nature of the legislation I intend to offer, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Maidenberry's article may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SMALL UNITS FOR EXPORTS SUGGESTED (By H. J. Maidenberry)

A bill aimed at alleviating the nation's balance-of-payments problem and also introducing small business to the advantages of overseas trade is being prepared by Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana.

It would group five or more small and intermediate-size manufacturers into Small Business Export Trade Corporations. These units, modeled partly on existing Small Business Investment Corporations, would then receive most of the benefits available to larger concerns engaged in foreign trade.

The idea was developed by Eugene M. Lang, president of the Resources and Facilities Corporation (REFAC), several years ago. Mr. Lang, interviewed here the other day, declared:

"Under the past and present Administrations, proposals for export expansion have, in a practical sense, almost always completely ignored the vast potential offered by the products and know-how of more than 200,000 small businesses.

"The thinking of policy makers has been and still is big business oriented. What will help the overseas programs of industrial giants does not solve the difficulties that keep small manufacturers from foreign markets. Small business problems cannot be solved in big business terms."

#### COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY

Based in large measure on REFAC's 18 years of representing small business interests in many foreign lands, the Small Business Export Trade Corporations should assure the units suitable operating facilities and staff on a capital investment of at least \$100,000.

Mr. Lang said the SBETC, "operating at its own risk and expenses, would have complete export responsibility for its clients; negotiate and administer all license and joint-venture projects, and police the overseas work and interests of clients."

Any legislation, Mr. Lang continued, should provide for any capital losses to be deducted from ordinary income by SBETC investors under the same procedures followed by Small Business Investment Corporations.

In addition, SBETC profits would be taxed at Western Hemisphere corporation rates (38 per cent), except for profits on exports to member countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades.

Foreign income blocked abroad should not be taxable until it could be repatriated. Such funds, Mr. Lang said, could be invested in the licensed or joint ventures (and only in such enterprises) producing the blocked income.

Other features of the proposed legislation, which is also being studied by some members of the House, would permit the creation of a bad debt reserve of up to 50 per cent of the uninsured and unsecured amounts of export receivables at the end of each fiscal year, to a maximum of \$50,000 for each SBETC member in the unit.

Mr. Lang noted that many overseas ventures often do not require any financial outlays. "A joint venture can often be set up abroad with only the investment of know-how," he explained. "REFAC has participated—and learned from its mistakes—by helping several hundred small manufacturers to license or assemble their products, or engage in joint ventures in 31 lands, developed and undeveloped, since 1952.

"The total dollar feedback to our country from dividends, royalties, engineering fees and profits since then is more than \$100-million," he said. As participants in these ventures abroad, REFAC grosses about \$6-million a year.

#### EXAMPLE CITED

Most small manufacturers cannot afford or do not know how to establish themselves in foreign markets, he said. "One outfit was ready to sell copies of a product design to a Japanese concern for \$25,000. They thought the deal was terrific—\$25,000 for photostats. No thought was given to the possibility that the product could eventually be sold in this country."

REFAC's Tokyo office learned of the deal. Mr. Lang went on, and made an arrangement under which the manufacturers now receive 4 per cent of the Japanese concern's sales of the product on a royalty basis, after having received \$100,000 as an initial payment.

April 23, 1968

RICHARD M. NIXON SPEAKS WITH  
COURAGE AND CANDOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the courage and candor which have marked the recent statements by Richard M. Nixon deserve the attention and commendation of all thoughtful Americans of both parties.

At a time when presidential aspirants are scurrying across the face of America, each seeking to outpromise the other with pledges of billions of Federal dollars committed to the problems of the cities, Dick Nixon's blunt refusal to join the game is as praiseworthy as is his exposure of such promises as "dishonest and a cruel delusion."

No segment of our society, Mr. President, will more quickly recognize the rightness of Mr. Nixon's stand than the responsible leaders of the Negro community. They understand that the bitterness and frustration which has flared into violence, looting, arson, and murder have in part resulted from unfulfilled and unfulfillable promises—promises cynically made in the name of political expediency.

It is a serious matter, Mr. President, to break a promise; but it is a greater fault to make a promise which cannot be redeemed.

At the same time, Mr. Nixon has called for an \$8 billion cut in the Federal budget to prevent this Nation from "hurtling down the path toward the worst economic crisis of the postwar period."

Clearly, Dick Nixon has taken a long, hard look at two of the major problems imperiling America and has reached some hard conclusions. He recognizes that the social and economic ills which beset the Nation's cities must be cured, but he rejects the massive dosage of Federal dollars which can only raise new false hopes which have already been dashed "on the concrete of reality."

And he recognizes that unless there is a severe limitation by the President on Government spending the country faces what William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has termed "uncontrollable recession or uncontrollable inflation."

It is significant that Mr. Nixon insists that the President must assign the places where the budget is to be cut. This accords with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and with our system of Government. The President occupies the one seat in Government from which such readjustments can be made; only he has all the facts, only he can weigh the relative urgency of thousands of programs; only he can assign meaningful priorities.

No single Member of the Congress and no committee or group of committees is in a position to make such recommendations. It is the responsibility of the President. If he shirks it, as Mr. Nixon reminds us, history will not judge him kindly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, news accounts of Mr. Nixon's two remarkable speeches over the past weekend, together with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday which couples the grave warnings of Chairman Martin with those of Mr. Nixon and concludes:

Comments such as these add up to an unpopular version of the state of the union. But we think it is a responsible version. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that it will be the little people—the poor and those living on savings and pensions—who will suffer most cruelly if the warnings go unheeded and if the dire prophecies are fulfilled.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1968]  
POOR-AID PROMISES IRK NIXON—SAYS NEEDY  
ARE MISLED BY POLITICIANS

(By Ward Just)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., April 20.—Richard M. Nixon asserted today that politicians' promises of billions to rebuild America's cities were "dishonest and a cruel delusion" and declared he would not join in that game "whether it costs the election or not."

He made it clear he supported programs to aid the poor, but said that large Federal outlays were not now feasible. He said that such programs "made good headlines" but until the time came when money could be diverted from the Vietnam war he would not join the "parade of candidates" offering dollar solutions.

At a press conference prior to a meeting with Minneapolis business and industrial leaders, the former Vice President named Democrat Sens. Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene J. McCarthy as examples of politicians who have made such promises.

He said he did not know the position held by Republican Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. On Thursday before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, Rockefeller proposed expenditures of \$150 billion over the next 10 years for urban reconstruction.

Nixon put his remarks in the context of what he called "one of the greatest financial crisis in our history." He implied that the economy could not support the kind of proposals his opponents were suggesting.

Echoing a favorite line of former Republican presidential candidate George Romney, the Michigan Governor, Nixon said that money alone would not improve the lot of Negroes.

What was required for the Negro, he said, was a sense of "dignity" which would come with "respect" from the white community. "I am not prepared to say that we should give the Negro a certain program in order to buy his allegiance," he said.

He spoke of the "family budget," which he contended would erode as the dollar weakened. "I am not going to join those candidates who are promising more and more billions."

At another point he said: "I am going to tell it like it is."

Nixon asserted that Negroes with whom he has talked agree with him. "Negro leaders know they have been taken to the mountain top only to look into the valley of despair."

The former Vice President, now the only announced candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, appeared by his remarks to foreclose the possibility that he would propose any massive Federal urban programs in an election year in which the urban crisis is a principle campaign issue.

His remarks came as he embarked on his first extensive campaign swing since President Johnson's withdrawal on March 31 and the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4.

When President Johnson announced the bombing restrictions over North Vietnam and the prospect of peace talks, Nixon said he would observe a "moratorium" on criticism of the Administration; he has been virtually silent on the subject since then.

This campaign swing will take him

through eight states, all of them with Republican Governors. He met yesterday with Romney and will continue through North Dakota, Wyoming, Nevada, Oregon, Idaho and South Dakota after he leaves Minnesota.

The object is to enlist the support of the Governors and their delegations to the Republican National Convention. Nixon and his associates are telling the Governors that the former Vice President is a certain winner in the convention, and the time to get on the bandwagon is now.

Evidence to support this view is a new Gallup poll, which was distributed to newsmen by Nixon staffers today. The poll, taken the week following the Johnson withdrawal, the King murder and the commencement of rioting, shows Nixon winning over McCarthy, Kennedy and Vice President Humphrey.

Nixon backers were jubilant over their man's performance Friday at the ASNE meeting in Washington. Nixon gave a virtuoso performance in a question and answer session before a panel of editors.

These events are cited to contradict the talk that "Nixon can't win" and to convince the fence-sitters that the campaign, now being conducted with no opponents is gaining in momentum.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 21, 1968]  
NIXON ASSAILS "PIE IN SKY" PROMISES  
FOR GHETTO DWELLERS

(By Nathan Miller)

MINNEAPOLIS, April 20.—Richard M. Nixon said today he would rather lose the presidency than delude Negroes into believing "pie in the sky" massive Federal spending on urban programs is imminent.

"For any candidate or political leader to come before the American people and tell a group of the poor . . . that the Federal Government is massively increasing its spending programs now is dishonest and renders a cruel delusion," he told a news conference.

"I am just not going to join in that game whether it costs the election or not," Nixon declared at the start of a week-long, seven-state campaign swing through the Mid and Far West.

## FINANCIAL CRISIS

Pointing to statements by William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that the nation faces its worst financial crisis since 1931, Nixon said Federal spending should be cut rather than expanded.

Instead, he emphasized the need for more private spending to bring homes, schools and jobs to the Negro ghettos suggested the Government emphasize self-help programs and cited a "peace dividend" that could be applied to these problems if the Vietnam war begins to deescalate.

While the Republican presidential candidate carefully refrained from naming Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, who is showing signs of challenging him, among those making promises of massive aid, such criticism was obviously implied.

## THE \$150 BILLION PLAN

On Thursday, the New Yorker unveiled a \$150,000,000 ten-year plan to meet the urban crisis which Rockefeller blamed on "the deep confusion of our priorities and the neglect of national needs."

Nixon included the Democratic candidates—Senators Robert F. Kennedy (D., N.Y.) and Eugene J. McCarthy (D., Minn.), who have announced, and Vice President Humphrey, who has yet to formally enter the race—among those making promises which can't be fulfilled.

The candidate said he had talked with Negro leaders about the problems of the cities and found them "disillusioned with pie in the sky" promises of reform that do not materialize.

"They want to hear it as it is," he declared.

"They want to see it as it is. I'm going to tell them about it as it is."

Nixon said the problem facing the Negro is much deeper than the "litany of more jobs, housing and education . . . It is problem of dignity, of their desire for respect . . . there is no easy gimmick to resolve these problems."

The former vice president, who had been expected to campaign on his experience in foreign affairs, has been faced with the problem that the main issue of this campaign is likely to be the urban crisis that has flared into racial turmoil and is trying to establish a position.

At today's press conference and following a three-hour private talk last night with Gov. George Romney, a Rockefeller supporter, at the Michigander's home, Nixon hit hard on the proposition that the Federal Government is in no position to undertake reform programs that require massive spending.

#### POSSIBILITY REMOTE

"We both as realists recognize that the possibility in the immediate future of massive infusions of money into the problems of our cities is remote," Nixon had said, and Romney agreed.

"There is going to be a great deal of money spent. But it's a delusion to tell people who are living in the ghettos that billions in new money is going to flow into the ghettos in the next few months."

Today, Nixon said he would not comment on Rockefeller's \$150,000,000,000 program until he had seen more of the details. He also accused Kennedy of trying to appropriate such Republican programs as tax incentives to business and industry wishing to improve ghetto conditions, saying "I'm glad he's seen the light."

#### FIGURE TOO LOW

In the long run, Nixon said the \$150,000,000,000 figure set by Rockefeller may be too low, adding that perhaps \$500,000,000,000 to \$750,000,000,000 in both Federal and private capital will be needed by the cities over the next third of the century.

Following the press conference, Nixon, buoyed up by the favorable reception given his appearance yesterday before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, Nixon met privately with business, industrial and professional leaders.

Representative MacGregor (R., Minn.), his local campaign manager, said Nixon discussed the problems of the cities and methods to "energize" private enterprise to provide jobs and houses for ghetto dwellers.

MacGregor said Nixon's statements were "well received" by his audience, which totaled about 90 persons.

Tonight the candidate spoke at a Young Republicans dinner at Moorhead, Minn., where he again stressed his approach to solving urban problems and the need for party unity.

His aides were quick to point out that Nixon's speech and answers to questions had been greeted with repeated applause while Rockefeller's urban reform speech the day before had been greeted with almost universal silence.

While he received an enthusiastic airport reception last night from a small group of followers who braved a torrential downpour, there were no Minnesota Republican leaders on hand.

Political leaders in Minnesota—as elsewhere—are staying "loose" according to local political observers, although straw polls are said to show Nixon is the preferred candidate among Minnesota Republicans.

But Gov. Harold L. Vander is a member of the newly formed Rockefeller for President Committee and most of the candidates for the State's 26 delegates to the national convention are said to be uncommitted. The Governor, now in Hawaii, is one of the few governors Nixon will see during this trip.

In the face of the lukewarm reception that has greeted his candidacy, Nixon has emphasized party unity in the face of the blood-letting among the Democrats.

"From Rockefeller on the left to Goldwater on the right, it is the desire of all Republicans to unite at this time," he told newsmen.

[From the Sunday Star, Apr. 21, 1968]

#### NIXON—NO GHETTO PROMISES

MINNEAPOLIS.—Richard M. Nixon said yesterday he would rather lose the presidential election than promise immediate and massive aid programs to the poor in America. He called such promises "dishonest and a cruel delusion."

He said not only Negroes but all ghetto dwellers in the nation have been misled.

Answering a question at a news conference in Minneapolis, Nixon said:

"What we are talking about now is an immediate financial crisis. And for any candidate or any political leader to come before the American people and tell a group of the poor, a group of people living in poor housing, a group of people who want jobs, that right now the federal government is going to massively increase its spending program—that's dishonest and it's a cruel delusion to whom it's told.

"And I'm just not going to join that game, whether it costs the election or not."

At another point Nixon said, "And at this time I, for one, am simply not going to join this parade of candidates who come before the American people with promises of billions in spending now when it just isn't in the cards."

Nixon described his own programs for the poor, referring to job banks, and his contention that the more immediate and realistic solution is to bring private enterprise into the ghettos, providing jobs for Negroes, "and not just menial jobs, but as managers and directors."

He was asked if he had discussed this matter with Negro leaders. He said he had and that their reaction to his ideas was "very favorable." Nixon said:

"When they speak privately they are greatly disillusioned with this pie-in-the-sky approach. Negro leaders know that they have been taken to the mountain top and then have looked into the valley of despair."

Nixon referred several times to what he called the "greatest financial crisis of this century." He said it is necessary now to cut the federal budget, not to increase it.

He added that the Negroes should be spoken to with "candor" and be told "what we can do and what we cannot. I think they want to hear it as it is and see it as it is."

Nixon expressed the view that the promises of large-scale aid to the poor, which he said were "unrealistic," had contributed to the frustrations and thus indirectly to the recent riots.

Nixon came into Minnesota late Friday night. A Minnesota politician said straw votes taken in 77 of the state's 87 counties indicated Nixon is far ahead of other potential Republican candidates. "He ran ahead of everybody in two-thirds of the counties and drew 60 per cent of the vote," the source said.

#### ONE FIGHT AVOIDED

As Nixon was speaking, his Minnesota backers at a district GOP convention in Willmar dropped earlier plans to seek an endorsement for him, said they would settle instead for a straw vote among the delegates, which they said they expected to win. Nixon backers said the request to avoid an endorsement fight had come from Nixon himself.

Nixon is on a tour of Midwest and Mountain states which takes him next week to Oregon. The Oregon primary will provide the first test of his strength against Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and Gov. Ronald Reagan of California, whose names

also are on the ballot. From Minneapolis, Nixon was scheduled to move on to Fargo, N.D. and neighboring Moorhead, Minn., where he speaks to a two-state young GOP meeting.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 22, 1968]

NIXON CALLS CUT IN BUDGET VITAL—SAYS ONLY JOHNSON ACTION CAN AVERT CRISIS

(By Nathan Miller)

CHEYENNE, Wyo., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon today challenged President Johnson to cut the Federal budget by \$8,000,000,000 to prevent the United States from "hurtling down the path toward the worst economic crisis of the postwar period."

The candidate for the Republican presidential nomination said in a statement shortly after his arrival here that the President should accept responsibility for earmarking the cuts to be made or face an indictment by history.

#### CONGRESS WILL FOLLOW

"In candor, we cannot expect that kind of leadership from a Congress very much in the political arena and halfway into an election year," Nixon declared. "But if the President will take the lead, the Congress and the country will follow."

Nixon, on the second day of an eight-day "soft-sell" campaign swing through the Middle and Far West, said "the Alphonse and Gaston act" that has gone on between the President and Congress over budget cuts "must end now and the President must end it . . ."

#### PRESSURE MOUNTS

"If he refuses, then history will not exonerate his abdication of leadership by blaming Congress for not cutting the President's budget. History will indict Lyndon Johnson for failing to do what he was elected to."

Pressure is building up on Congress to take action on the long-stalled 10 per cent income tax surcharge sought by the Administration as an anti-inflation weapon, but congressional leaders have been holding out for limitations on Federal spending before enacting it.

#### NOT REALISTIC

Nixon added that the proposed tax increase is by itself not enough to strengthen the nation's fiscal structure. If voted independently of sharp cuts in spending, he said, it will not succeed in doing the job.

Nixon combined the demand for presidential budget trimming with what has been a recurrent theme—the need for decreases in Federal spending to restore fiscal soundness. "Rules out any new vast outpouring of Federal funds into the cities of America this year."

"Those who are recommending massive increases now in Federal spending in the cities are, in my view, not being realistic," he said. "They are raising new false hopes that in the past have been dashed repeatedly on the concrete of reality."

#### TO GIVE PROGRAMS

"Today, the reality is that the budget must be cut; it must be cut in the neighborhood of \$8,000,000,000 and it must be cut by the President of the United States."

Nixon's aides said that despite the candidate's firm belief that immediate massive Federal spending on urban reform is impossible, he will outline new programs of aid to the cities within the next two weeks.

These proposals will add to such programs as a computerized "job bank" to bring jobs and the jobless together and tax incentives to private industry willing to help the ghetto dweller that Nixon has already proposed, aides said.

#### WILL COST LESS

They will, however, cost far less than the \$2,000,000,000 a month—equal to the current cost of the Vietnam war—recommended by a

April 23, 1968

White House conference on civil rights two years ago, they cautioned.

Some political analysts have begun questioning whether Nixon's repeated assertions that immediate help to resolve the urban crisis is impossible because of the financial crisis means he has decided to abandon hope of getting the Negro vote.

In contrast, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, who is talking like a candidate for the Republican nomination, has suggested a \$150,000,000 public-private crash program for the ghettos over the next decade and the Democratic candidates have also unveiled massive programs.

Nixon's statements appear tailored to the slightly right-of-center position that he usually takes, with an appeal to middle-class voters concerned that increased spending on the cities may be regarded as rewarding the rioters.

But when combined with emphasis on fiscal sanity, a resolve to make no promises to ghetto dwellers that cannot be kept and assurances of heavy public and private spending in the future, it appears short of an appeal to overt racial overtones.

Except in Oregon where he will take part in the May 28 primary in which the names of Rockefeller and Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California, have also been entered. Nixon will make few public appearances during the low-key tour.

He is confining himself to televised press conferences, private meetings with Republican stalwarts and attempts to sell all GOP governors. Little effort is being made to turn out large crowds to see him.

He has said he wishes to see if the governors have any solutions for state problems that can be transferred to the national level, saying the state governments have been overlooked when such solutions are sought.

Meetings were held with Governors Spiro T. Agnew, of Maryland; Warren Knowles, of Wisconsin; James Rhodes, of Ohio; John Volpe, of Massachusetts and Claude Kirk, of Florida, before starting this swing.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 22, 1967]  
NIXON CALLS FOR \$8 BILLION SPENDING CUT—  
CONSIDERS TAX HIKE AS SECONDARY

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon took a day off from campaigning with a stop in Cheyenne today, but not before calling for a 8 billion dollar federal spending cut and a tax hike.

Nixon stepped off a jet at Cheyenne's airport wearing a blue suit and a wide smile for the 200 women and teen-agers who pressed against a restraining fence.

He will fly to Helena, Mont., tomorrow to resume his campaign for the 1968 Republican Presidential nomination.

#### MEETING IS DELAYED

Wyoming's Republican Governor Stan Hathaway was unable to meet with Nixon until an early-evening dinner at the red-brick governor's mansion because of prior commitments in the northern part of the state.

The former vice president, on his first Wyoming visit since the 1960 campaign, said he agree with a warning by William McChesney Martin Jr. of the federal reserve board that the nation's financial crisis was the worst since the depression.

"I agree with Martin about the plight of the nation, but there is only one way we can meet it," Nixon said. "It is imperative the federal budget be cut by \$8 billion."

#### SPENDING CUT FIRST

He said a tax hike should take a back seat in priority to a spending cut, which Republicans have said is a must before President Johnson's 10 per cent surtax is passed.

Nixon said administration efforts to cut travel abroad and solve the international monetary crisis with "paper gold" were stop-

gap measures and came too late to do much good.

Nixon then slipped on a topcoat against the chilly Wyoming wind and stepped briskly to the airport's wire fence to shake hands with supporters carrying placards reading: "Nixon's the One."

#### QUESTION ON CHURCH

When a man asked if he had been to church, Nixon replied, "I've been way up high," and pointed to the cloudy skies.

Nixon dispelled talk he was seeking to line up delegate votes at the G.O.P. national convention at Miami this summer. He said his talks with Hathaway, who has indicated his support, but is not formally committed to any candidate, "is an issue discussion, and not a delegate discussion."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1968]

CHALLENGES JOHNSON ON BUDGET—NIXON  
URGES \$8 BILLION CUTS

(By Ward Just)

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon challenged President Johnson today to "grasp the nettle" and cut the national budget by \$8 billion. He described the Nation as "hurtling down a path toward the worst economical crisis of the postwar era."

The former Vice President, in a statement issued here this afternoon, said that the "Alphonse and Gaston Act" that has gone on between the President and Congress must end. He said the President, without future ambition, was in an "envious political position" to designate precisely where his budget should be cut.

If the President refuses to act, Nixon said, "then history will not exonerate his application of leadership by blaming Congress . . . history will indict Lyndon Johnson for failing to do what he was elected to do."

Nixon who flew here today to confer with Republican Gov. Stan Hathaway painted a bleak picture of the Nation's economy, which he said was in crisis because of "fiscal mismanagement by the Government of the United States."

If the savings and income of "tens of millions" of Americans are to be safeguarded, he said, "if the international monetary system is to remain intact, if the American dollar is to survive its crisis of confidence abroad, then the United States must act now."

Federal action, he went on, "cannot be the half-hearted, half-measures we have seen in the past. It is far too late in the day to correct our massive payments in balance by taxing American tourists or restricting American investment abroad. It is too late for book-keeping measures . . . our fiscal house must be put in order now."

Nixon added said that the statement today implicitly "rules out" any proposals by the Republican candidate for massive infusions of Federal funds into the cities to help what has been called the urban crisis.

The aides disclosed that Nixon would make two statements within the next fortnight outlining inexpensive programs to help the cities. Aides have indicated that Nixon felt the economic crisis was so serious that the Nation could not afford large-scale programs.

In the statement issued today, Nixon charged that "those who are recommending massive increases now in Federal spending in the cities are . . . not being realistic. They are raising anew the same false hopes that in the past have been dashed repeatedly on the concrete of reality."

Nixon placed responsibility for budget cuts squarely at the door of the President:

"He alone has access to the mountains of information and the volumes of data with which to set priority programs and limits on spending. No Congressman, no Senator and no Congressional committee has the information or knowledge that is at the fingertips of the President of the United States."

At a press conference in Minneapolis yesterday, he said that presidential candidates who were offering massive Federal programs to aid the poor were being "dishonest" and practicing a "cruel delusion" on the intended recipients of aid.

He implied that the candidates who offered the programs—he named Democratic candidates Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene J. McCarthy were trying to buy the allegiance of Negroes. Nixon argued that the economy could not support the proposals.

Since the President announced his withdrawal from the campaign, and preliminary peace contacts between Washington and Hanoi have begun, Nixon has eased his attacks on Mr. Johnson. He has been observing a self-imposed "moratorium" of criticisms on the Administration's conduct of the war.

But lately the former Vice President has stepped up his attacks on Democratic rivals, and now appears to be focusing on the Administration's role in the economy as a key campaign issue.

In the document released today, Nixon referred to "budgetary gimmicks and rhetorical exercises . . . for the past five years this Administration has run an uninterrupted stream of budget deficits that have accumulated to a sum in the neighborhood of \$55 billion . . ."

He described the President's withdrawal as a "selfless act" and said "that is why he is the man who can exercise leadership in designating precisely where the budget should be cut." In a political year, he went on, it was unrealistic to expect action by Congress.

If the President will take the lead, the Nixon statement said, "then Congress and the country will follow."

NIXON URGES JOHNSON TO CUT BUDGET BY  
\$8 BILLION—PLANS TWO MAJOR STATEMENTS  
TO EXPLAIN HIS PROGRAM OF AID TO THE  
POOR

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon today challenged President Johnson to cut the budget by \$8-billion and said that history would judge the President harshly if he failed to do so.

The former Vice President, who flew here this morning to confer with Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway, also declared—for the third time in three days—that the "economic crisis" now afflicting the country "rules out any vast new outpouring of Federal funds into the cities this year."

Mr. Nixon said that "those who are recommending massive increases now in Federal spending in the cities are, in my view, not being realistic."

"They are raising anew the same false hopes that in the past have been dashed repeatedly on the concrete of reality," he said. "Today, the reality is that the budget must be cut; it must be cut in the neighborhood of \$8-billion, and it must be cut by the President of the United States."

#### VIEWS OF OTHER CANDIDATES

Mr. Nixon's estimate of the chances for greater spending in the cities this year has been considerably more severe than the estimate of any other major Presidential candidate in the political arena.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York, both announced Democratic candidacies, and Governor Rockefeller of New York, who has said he would accept a Republican draft, have all promised elaborate programs to rebuild the cities.

But Mr. Nixon's statement today—coming on top of his remarks to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Friday and his remarks at a news conference in Minneapolis yesterday—indicate beyond doubt that he will not engage in competitive bidding with his rivals in order, as he put it in

April 23, 1968

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300070016-1 S 4413

Minneapolis yesterday, "to buy the allegiance of the Negro."

Mr. Nixon's bleak prognosis of spending prospects in the cities was softened somewhat by the news that he would offer, within the next two weeks, two major statements on urban problems that will contain, according to his aides, "two specific programs" for alleviating the plight of the poor.

In his campaign, Mr. Nixon has repeatedly expressed his sympathy for the economic and political objectives of the Negro poor. He has called for "tax and credit programs" that would "enlist" private enterprise in the drive on unemployment and for housing.

But he has never described these programs in any detail. Many observers have believed that he would soon be obliged to say specifically what he does want to do because he has said so often and so emphatically what he does not want to do—spend vast new sums of Federal money in the cities.

#### QUESTIONS AMONG STAFF

To do otherwise, these observers believe, would risk the permanent enmity of the Negroes themselves and invite criticism from his rivals.

There has been considerable discussion within his staff, accordingly, about the timing of specific proposals. Some have argued that he should withhold specific programs until later in the campaign when they might have greater impact on the electorate.

Others, however, have insisted that for Mr. Nixon to rule any extensive Federal spending without offering specific non-Federal alternatives would leave him in a politically vulnerable position.

The news that Mr. Nixon will shortly offer detailed programs indicates that the second group has prevailed.

An aide indicated that Mr. Nixon's programs would "cost money" but not "\$2-billion a week," a figure that is commensurate with the costs of the Vietnam war and that has been urged by some civil rights leaders.

In his statement this afternoon, the former Vice President, now considered the front-runner for the Republican Presidential nomination, described the nation as "hurtling down a path toward the worst economic crisis of the post-war era."

Mr. Nixon noted that the international monetary system was under severe strain and that prices had steadily increased. He attributed the crisis to "fiscal mismanagement by the Government of the United States" and "an uninterrupted string of budget deficits that have accumulated to a sum in the neighborhood of \$50-billion."

The candidate insisted that only the President had both the information and authority to put "our fiscal house in order."

He added: "The Alphonse and Gaston act that has gone on with regard to this budget between the White House and Capitol Hill must end now, and the President must end it."

[From the Washington Evening Star,  
Apr. 22, 1968]

#### FINANCIAL CRISIS

Both William McChesney Martin Jr. and Richard Nixon have come forward in recent days with grim comments on the state of our nation's financial affairs. There are those who say that the bleakness of the picture is being overdrawn. Maybe so, but we doubt it. And it surely is the part of prudence to listen with close attention to the warnings, not to scoff at them.

As chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Martin cannot possibly be suspected of political or ulterior motives. This country, he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors last week, is plagued by "an intolerable balance of payments deficit side by side with an intolerable domestic deficit. Both have to

be corrected, and both have to be corrected over the next several years, or the United States is going to face either an uncontrollable recession or an uncontrollable inflation."

As a presidential candidate, Nixon, we suppose, can be accused of playing politics. But the things he is saying are not what one would expect from an unscrupulous politician.

This nation, he has said, is "hurtling" down a path toward the worst economic crisis of the postwar era. As an immediate remedy he is calling for an \$8 billion cut in federal spending and a prompt tax increase—the same general remedial steps urged by Martin. Furthermore, Nixon has stated that he would rather lose the presidential election than promise immediate and massive aid programs to the poor of this country. The economy, he insists, cannot support the massive aid programs that have been proposed, and "I for one am simply not going to join the parade of candidates who come before the American people with promises of billions in spending now when it just isn't in the cards."

Comments such as these add up to an unpopular version of the state of the union. But we think it is a responsible version. Furthermore, it should never be forgotten that it will be the little people—the poor and those living on savings and pensions—who will suffer most cruelly if the warnings go unheeded and if the dire prophecies are fulfilled.

#### WILL THIS BE THE LONG ROAD TO PEACE OR TO DISILLUSIONMENT?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on March 31, 1968, when President Johnson announced dramatically that he had ordered the partial cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam the hope for peace which springs eternal in the human heart was given added strength.

In the 3 weeks which have elapsed since then, however, that hope has begun to ebb as the jockeying for propaganda advantage between the United States and North Vietnam continues. Those unseemly maneuverings bring into question the bona fides of both sides, since men continue to die in the battles raging in South Vietnam and in the air strikes over North Vietnam south of the 20th parallel.

In the light of the reports of ever-increasing infiltration of South Vietnam by North Vietnam regular troops, one begins to wonder whether President Johnson's half-a-loaf bombing pause was in fact the correct step along the road to peace. There are many who believe that we would be further along the road to peace—if, in fact, we have made any progress at all along that tortuous road since March 31—if President Johnson had at that time announced the permanent and unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam and had coupled that announcement with a call for an immediate, in-place, cease-fire in South Vietnam.

Such action on the part of the United States would have clearly raised the peace issue for all the world to see. It would have forced reciprocal action on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong who could not find themselves in the absolutely untenable position of being the only ones to continue to kill Vietnamese men, women, and children.

A penetrating, perceptive and accurate analysis of the events of the last 3 weeks since President Johnson's announcement is contained in the lead editorial entitled "Peace: That Elusive Promise," published in the Anchorage Daily News for April 19, 1968.

#### The editorial states:

The unhappy record of blunder piled on blunder has characterized what the administration piously describes as the Search for Peace in the past 3 years. Promising initiatives have been aborted through inept co-ordination, through paranoid obsession with secrecy, through Hanoi obduracy and American obduracy, through, on occasion, rank incompetence.

The editorial correctly points out that since the President's announcement of the limitation on the area of the North Vietnam subject to bombing, the bomb load statistics have been as high as, or higher than before.

#### The editorial concludes:

Wherever the truth may be found, the fact remains that President Johnson lofted what was widely regarded as a tangible peace initiative 20 days ago. And in what history must record as a tortured irony, the allied military set out, simultaneously on a massive sweep entitled "Operation Complete Victory."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### PEACE: THAT ELUSIVE PROMISE

Twenty days ago President Lyndon Johnson announced that he was taking unilateral action to deescalate the war in Vietnam by sharply reducing the target areas for American bombers in the North.

He accompanied the announcement of that decision with an earnest plea to the North Vietnamese to join representatives of the United States at a peace table somewhere—anywhere—to bring the whole bloody mess to an end.

And lest his motives be misread as election year politics, he dramatically announced he was scratching his name from consideration for renomination and re-election. The nation and the world reacted with relief at the prospect of peace, acclaim for the President's selfless act.

Now, twenty days later, the adversaries are bogged down in a childish controversy over a meeting site for the preliminary negotiations. Even in the arcane world of diplomacy it is difficult to believe that the physical location of the meeting can be of more than passing importance. Both Hanoi and Washington are behaving like a pair of five-year-olds and meantime soldiers continue to die, civilians continue to die, and the hemorrhage goes on in a country that has spent twenty years on the rack of war.

#### Consider:

President Johnson has said—and he has reiterated—that he is a man of peace, that our sole objective in South Vietnam is a stable, viable, freely-chosen government in South Vietnam; that he is prepared to go anywhere at any time to discuss with the masters of Hanoi the terms of peace.

How, in the name of reason, can we square such unequivocal words with the interminable schoolboy debate over a meeting site?

#### And Consider:

The unhappy record of blunder piled on blunder has characterized what the administration piously describes as the Search for Peace in the past three years. Promising initiatives have been aborted through inept co-ordination, through paranoid obsession with secrecy, through Hanoi obduracy and



April 23, 1968

American obduracy, through, on occasion, rank incompetence.

And finally, consider:

Since we pulled back our bombers from Hanoi and Halphong, limiting them to penetration only to the 20th parallel, the bomb load statistics have been as high as, or higher than, the loads we were dropping before the President's announcement on March 31. What this particular act of de-escalation has meant, then, is that comparable bomb loads have been concentrated on a smaller piece of real estate.

Meantime, Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford says there is no sign that North Vietnam has responded with measurable de-escalation to the bombing limitation. (Reports from correspondents in the field, however, contradict Clifford's appraisal. They agree there is solid evidence that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese effort has slackened, perhaps as a preliminary to disengagement.)

Wherever the truth may be found, the fact remains that President Johnson lofted what was widely regarded as a tangible peace initiative twenty days ago. And in what history must record as a tortured irony, the allied military set out, simultaneously on a massive sweep entitled "Operation Complete Victory."

### THE LESSONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Bill D. Moyers, formerly special assistant to the President and now the publisher of Newsday, Inc., has written a perceptive and thought-provoking article entitled "The Lessons and Implications of Vietnam." It is a succinct article, and I commend it to the attention of Senators and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and may not have access to Newsday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LESSONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF VIETNAM  
(By Bill D. Moyers, former special assistant to the President)

Even if human reason and mutual concessions fail, the law of averages will eventually settle the war in Vietnam. There never has been a war that did not end in one way or the other, in one generation or another. At this moment, despite the noises between Hanoi and Washington, that is about the only certainty on which to pin one's optimism. Mankind survives man's worst mistakes.

But what will we have learned?

We will have learned—or re-learned, I should say—an old truism: the law of national sovereignty requires that people be able to organize their search for liberty, identity, and happiness—not to mention the right to err—in ways that are relevant to their own experience and value. For all our good intentions and Puritan sense of mission, we cannot change that law. As the Soviet Union is learning in Eastern Europe, and as we will inevitably learn in Southeast Asia, a nation cannot use its military power to establish or even to preserve institutions in other countries which are incompatible to the nature of the people over whom the contest is being waged. It is altogether possible, as D. W. Brogan has suggested, that "there will be no South Vietnamese state committed emotionally, ideologically, by gratitude, by necessity, to follow the policies of the U.S. in Asia, and still less in the world."

#### EMERGENCE OF PLURAL WORLD

We will also have learned that a truly plural world has emerged beyond any single bloc's control. We are caught at the present

between the last vestiges of a cold war between two great power blocs and the emergence of independent and interdependent nation states. The revival of nationalism in every part of the globe, while relieving the cold war between the two great blocs, has already brought about conditions which no single large power can dominate and no international organization is yet strong enough to control. Given the nature of the instabilities in the technologically undeveloped world, neither the Soviets nor the Americans nor the United Nations can prevent those instabilities from creating one crisis after another.

Therefore? Therefore, we must avoid giving every specific conflict an ultimate value. Why should these conflicts become Armageddon unless national survival is truly at stake? In practical terms, this means that no great power should enter these conflicts in such a way as to leave another great power with the single alternative of surrender. Peace in this turbulent period depends upon the ability of the large powers to agree, not upon a clash of stubborn wills, the only resolution of which is an ultimate test of arms.

Lesson No. 3 follows from the fact: there are some wars which can be neither won nor lost—only disposed of. Twenty years of the "balance of terror" should have convinced both the U.S. and the Soviet Union that nuclear power is at best—and at worst—apocalyptic power. Its possession assures us only of the means to annihilate one another.

Simultaneously, the decline of military ideology and the rise of nationalism in independent states restrict the efficacy of power in local conflicts. We intervened in Vietnam for a paradoxical purpose—to prevent a military victory, not to win one. For it is apparent to reasonable men not inebriated by the infallibility of their own ideology that the situation in Southeast Asia defies a military solution. For one thing, we are dealing with people who do not wish to be defended at an excessively high cost; and for another, the conditions that created this conflict will persist beyond any military resolution short of the total defeat of one or more of the parties. Of that kind of resolution we would be able to say, with Tacitus: "It was rather a cessation of war than a beginning of peace."

There is yet another lesson which is becoming apparent because of Vietnam: the primary threat to world peace has shifted from Europe to Asia. Ironically, however, Vietnam has distorted the significance of this shift.

Since 1945 the principal threat to western security has been the Soviet Union. It remains a danger. But as the countries of Eastern Europe have moved from the status of satellites to allies with separate ambitions, as the countries of Western Europe have prospered, as the Soviet Union has turned more and more to the internal needs of its people, the immediate danger in Europe has diminished. It has shifted to Asia, and principally to the enigma that is China. Unfortunately our preoccupation with Vietnam has not enabled us to think clearly and objectively about China. On the contrary, the important issues have been more darkly obscured by the fog of rhetoric rising from the camps of the hawks and the doves over the emotionally-charged issue of Asia communism.

This is a time for question-asking. Will China prove as militarily belligerent as she is verbally belligerent? Would she be able, if she sought to do so, to mobilize unified support in the Communist world for expansionist policies? What are the prospects that, as in the Soviet Union, militant ideological creeds will bend to the issues of problem-solving and social change? Has a century of abrasive exploitation by western powers, mixed with the dogmatism of her

present leaders, rendered her hopelessly paranoid toward the West? What is the correct military posture toward China so that we are strong enough to avert the worst and wise enough to recognize opportunities of accommodation if they appear? Are we wise enough to direct our concern not against the Chinese people or even against internal Chinese communism, but against any real—and real should be stressed—acts of aggression?

#### DIFFUSE POWER CENTERS

In the meantime, Vietnam has demonstrated how urgently we must encourage diffuse centers of power throughout Asia so that the people of that region can reconcile their differences among themselves. Painful as it is for us to admit, their needs cannot be met ultimately by decisions in Washington or Moscow. They must be met by decisions in their own capitals. Since World War II we have filled the power vacuums in South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, and Indochina; in light of what we have learned, the burden of our rhetoric must become the brunt of our policy: an insistence that these and other Asian countries, including North Vietnam, determine the future character of Asia by their own political devices.

This does not mean that we should be so frustrated by the agonies of the war in Vietnam that we think simply to "pull back" will strengthen the peace in Asia. It does mean that of the lessons we have learned, the greatest is the lesson of humility. No matter how vast our power, we cannot create order and peace, much less justice and dignity, in Asia. These depend only in a limited sense upon the military deterrence of those who still advocate force; in the larger, most lasting, sense they can be won only by the political imagination of the people whose own way of life is at stake.

### OFFICIAL METHODIST RESOLUTION DECLARES FOR PEACE STEPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the general board of Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church, on February 29, 1968, adopted a statement on the war in Vietnam which was very critical of the American policy. This action was taken at their annual meeting held in San Antonio, Tex.

It should be noted that after President Johnson's announcement of the cessation of bombing over most of North Vietnam, Dr. Dudley Ward, general secretary of the Methodist board, made arrangements to go to Prague, Czechoslovakia, to persuade church leaders gathered there from Communist countries that this action by the United States was a genuine effort to get negotiations started and that there should be a prompt and affirmative response by the North Vietnamese Government. Dr. Ward canceled the trip to Prague after learning of the continued U.S. bombing of targets more than 200 miles inside North Vietnam, feeling that the continued bombing destroyed his case with the churchmen from Communist countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution on Vietnam adopted by the general board of Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: